

# Public Forum

Date: Tuesday, 31 October 2023



## Agenda

### 1. Public Statements Received

Ref No	Name	Title
PS01	Bristol Tree Forum	Bristol Local Plan
PS02	Avon Wildlife Trust	Bristol Local Plan
PS03	Dominic Hogg	Bristol Local Plan
PS04	Adblock Bristol	Bristol Local Plan
PS05	David Redgewell	Medium Term Financial Plan

(Pages 2 - 18)

### 2. Public Questions Received

Ref No	Name	Title
PQ01	Rob Bryher	Bristol Local Plan
PQ02	Haydn Gill	Medium Term Financial Plan
PQ03	Michelle Tedder	Bristol Local Plan
PQ04	Peter Ellis	Bristol Local Plan
PQ05	Dan Ackroyd	Minutes of Previous Meeting
PQ06	Ad Block Bristol	Bristol Local Plan
PQ07	Bristol Civic Society	Bristol Local Plan

(Pages 19 - 27)

Issued by: Oliver Harrison, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE

E-mail: [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)



## STATEMENT PS 01

### Submitted by Bristol Tree Forum

#### Title: Bristol Local Plan

The Mayor has now published the next iteration of the proposed new Local Plan (LP). This will be brought before you at Full Council on 31 October next. The Mayor recommends (item 8) that, under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the draft LP will be formally published in order for representations to be made and then submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.

The sustainability appraisal documents are published on the Local Plan Review web page. In our opinion the proposed LP is not yet ready for further consultation, let alone independent examination, for the following reasons:

1. It does not contain enough detailed information about the sites in the adopted LP to allow for a proper consultation or independent examination.
2. Protection for green spaces has been reduced, contrary to adopted Council policy.
3. Despite the recent Ecological and Climate Emergency Declarations, this draft provides fewer environmental protections than the adopted LP.
4. Comments on earlier drafts appear largely to have been ignored, rendering the consultation process flawed.

#### Our response in detail

Section 20 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that the authority must not submit the proposed LP unless they think the document is ready for independent examination. In our view, the proposed LP is not yet ready for further consultation, let alone independent examination. Our reasons are set out in detail below:

1. A **proper consultation** has not been conducted. In a 2001 judgement Lord Woolf defined a proper consultation as containing four elements.<sup>1</sup> The final element is that 'the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account when the ultimate decision is taken'. You have not responded to our carefully considered comments on both the 2019 and the 2022 consultations on earlier drafts of the LP and there is no evidence that the Local Plan Working Party even discussed them. We do not know how many other organisations who submitted comments were also ignored, because these have not been published.
2. When the 2019 document, New Protection for Open Space, was published for consultation, a schedule with maps was produced so that consultees could see which sites were being proposed and with what designation – **Local Green Space (LGS)** or **Reserved Open Space (ROS)**. No such document has been produced in this version, which means that there is no easy way for consultees to see what has been changed, added or removed – save for slavishly working through the only document showing the new designations set out in 08.3 Appendix A3 Policies Map. Whilst this may be sufficient for those interested only in the information at ward level, it is nigh on impossible for those with a city-wide interest.

3. An interactive GIS map of the proposed Bristol Local Plan Policies Map should be made available to facilitate examination. The pdf version provided has 38 layers in the Key and many sites have multiple designations, which makes it very difficult to interpret. The current Local Plan Policies map does this.

4. Whilst the document Appendix 3 Assessing the effects of the Publication Version Policies, cross-references, to a limited extent, how some proposed new policies relate to policies in the adopted LP, there is no equivalent schedule for the adopted policies which will be removed – Core, Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (SADMP) and ancillary Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) etc. - nor any comprehensive cross-tabulation showing which of the adopted LP policies have been transferred to the proposed LP and which have not.

5. No schedule has been prepared showing those sites protected under the adopted LP and whether they will be protected under the proposed LP. For example, SADMP DM17 currently provides protection for sites designated as **Important Open Spaces, Unidentified Open Spaces** and **Urban landscapes**. It appears that DM17 will be removed but that these current protections will not be adopted in the proposed LP. We have mapped 523 **Important Open Space** sites covering over 2,000 hectares. As far as we can see, some 1,000 hectares of these and all **Unidentified Open Spaces** and **Urban landscapes**, will no longer have any protection. If this is the case, then the proposals should make this clear. Our recent article, WILL COUNCILLORS HONOUR THEIR PROMISE TO PROTECT BRISTOL'S GREEN SPACES? addresses our wider concerns.

6. SNCIs are currently given protection from development under SADMP DM19. This states that *'Development which would have a harmful impact on the nature conservation value of a Site of Nature Conservation Interest will not be permitted'*. It is proposed that DM19 will be removed in its entirety. Under proposed new policy **BG2: Nature conservation and recovery**, this protection has been changed to read: *'Development which would have a significantly harmful impact on local wildlife and geological sites, comprising Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs) and Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) as shown on the Policies Map, will not be permitted.'* This is a dilution of the current protection enjoyed by SNCIs (and RIGS); the phrase 'significantly harmful' is a subjective judgement and undermines the current protection provided, especially when the Chief Planning Officer has recently advised Councillors that damage to an SNCI which is offset by onsite mitigations under the Biodiversity Metric is not harm.

7. Whilst we are very pleased to see that our campaign to have all those Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs) which were allocated for development in 2014 (save for BSA1305 – why?) has succeeded and have had their Site Allocations removed, we are concerned to note that not all of the 108 sites (not 85 as is wrongly suggested) have also been designated as LGS – some are ROS and some have no designation at all. No explanation has been given for this.

8. No schedule of the sites identified in BG2 has been produced. As we have pointed out, there are 108 SNCIs, not the 85 stated in Appendix 1: Sustainability Appraisal Updated

Scoping Report 2023 A1-4 (at page 26). A schedule of all these sites will enable consultees to identify and locate them.

9. In September 2021 the council unanimously resolved to protect the Green Belt and Bristol's green spaces. Despite this, around 30 of the 96 sites proposed for residential development are green spaces (nearly 40 hectares) and three areas in our urban Green Belt are proposed to be removed from the Green Belt for development. No new green or open spaces are proposed.

10. Proposed policy **BG4: Trees** is deeply flawed. As currently drafted it will allow developers to offset tree losses by using habitats that are not allowed under BNG 4.0. If allowed this will result in the hollowing out of Bristol's trees and frustrate the One City plan to increase tree canopy (see Annex A below).

11. The proposal that replacement trees '*should be located as close as possible to the development site*' will still allow developers remove trees to build, because all they need to do is pay compensation for their replacement with no concern for where they are to be planted. This will result in trees and their biodiversity being lost from those areas under greatest development pressure, with any offsite compensation being exported to already green suburbs and creating even greater tree inequalities.

12. It is proposed that development which would result in the loss of ancient woodland, or ancient or veteran trees, will not be permitted, but neither Bristol's known veteran trees nor its 11 ancient woodlands are mapped or expressly protected on the Bristol Local Plan Policies Map.

13. No express protection is given for other urban woodlands that are not ancient (woods that have not existed continuously since 1600), are not in a conservation area or are not protected with a TPO.

### **Our request**

Bristol City Council has recently declared both Climate and Ecological Emergencies and resolved to protect our green spaces. The Environment Act 2021 with its still-to-be-published regulations (which will be fully implemented in 2024 together with a proposed new version of the National Planning Policy Framework) will provide even greater environmental protections and the next iteration of the One City Plan aspires to achieve a significant increase of tree canopy. Yet, against all this, the proposed new Local Plan will result in reduced protection for the environment when compared with the current, adopted Local Plan.

In light of this, we ask you to reject the Mayor's recommendation until the above crucial issues have been addressed and insist that Bristol's nature does not continue to suffer yet more decades of decline but is properly protected.

**Annex A – Email to BCC Specialist Planning Policy Officer 21 October 2023**

Dear Michael, I see that the latest iteration of the proposed Local Plan has been published. We are examining it and will comment in due course, but we have to express serious concerns about the proposed new wording of Policy BG4: Trees.

We are disappointed that our proposal for BTRS has not been adopted, but we are also very concerned that this paragraph in particular, will provide developers with an opportunity to avoid replacing lost trees at all: 'Where the tree compensation standard is not already met in full by biodiversity net gain requirements (policy BG3 'Achieving biodiversity gains'), for instance because biodiversity net gain requirements do not apply to the development or because biodiversity gains are provided through a different habitat type, development will still be expected to meet the tree compensation standard on-site or off-site through an appropriate legal agreement.'

As you know, most trees in an urban environment will be classified as broad Individual tree habitat under BNG 4.0. This broad habitat has only two sub-types - rural and urban - and can only be replaced with the same broad habitat type (Individual tree) or by a more distinctive, High or Very High habitat. This means that other Medium (e.g. most woodland habitats) or Low distinctiveness habitats cannot be used without breaking the BNG 4.0 trading rules - as BG4 currently suggests it can. These High or Very High distinctiveness habitat types are rare, especially in the urban space.

In this case, developers (who will not have the space to create all the Individual tree habitat that BNG 4.0 will demand\*\*) will offer these or Individual tree habitats elsewhere and, because there are no such sites in Bristol, will offset the BNG losses out of the city, resulting in the hollowing out of Bristol's trees and frustrating the One City plan to increase tree canopy.

We suggest that the proposed wording could also make BG4 unworkable because it is contrary to the BNG 4.0 rules and guidance. We suggest that you delete the words 'or because biodiversity gains are provided through a different habitat type.'

Can you clarify whether the current Bristol Tree Replacement Standard SPD will remain, please. Is there a list of proposed deprecated policies and SPDs etc. available?

\*\* For example, one small single dwelling development we are looking at which would require five BTRS trees to be planted to replace the three lost, will require 148 BNG 4.0 Small category trees to be planted to achieve a net gain of just 10%. There is not enough room on the site to plant the five BTRS trees, let alone 148.

## **STATEMENT PS 02**

### **Submitted by Avon Wildlife Trust**

#### **Title: Bristol Local Plan**

Avon Wildlife Trust is calling for changes to the draft Local Plan before it is published.

The Plan needs:

- More ambition on the restoration of nature, in line with the ambitions of the One City Plan
- A requirement for 20% biodiversity net gain on all development to offset negative impacts and start to reverse ongoing and accelerating declines in nature

Avon Wildlife Trust welcomes the positive policies for nature included in the Plan and the decision to remove housing allocations from important wildlife sites such as Western slopes and Yew Tree Farm, but clearer more ambitious plans and actions are needed if we are to achieve the One City Plan ambitions of restoring the natural systems on which we all depend, improving habitats and bringing back wildlife.

The UK Government has committed to securing nature's recovery and protecting 30% of the UK's land by 2030, this goal is shared locally with the One City Ecological Emergency Strategy aiming to achieve:

"..30 per cent of land in Bristol to be managed for the benefit of wildlife."

At present there is a huge gap between meeting these goals and the current situation, as shown in the State of Nature report published on 27 September. The report states that the UK is one of the most nature-depleted countries on Earth and that one in six species is at risk of being lost altogether. The gap in Bristol – between the current state of affairs and the stated intent – is enormous. The draft Local Plan retains policies on nature and green infrastructure, but misses the opportunity to set out the positive spatial plan for nature that is required to achieve the ambitions in the Ecological Emergency Strategy. There appears to be little in the Plan to identify new land and wildlife corridors for nature. On the contrary, site allocations include identifying a range of sites for development that will reduce green space in the city, with significant risks of further damage to the city's natural systems and green infrastructure. More ambition is needed to protect Bristol's remaining green spaces, resort functioning natural systems and achieve the target of 30% of land managed for wildlife.

We are concerned by the lack of ambition with regards to Biodiversity Net Gain.

For decades, development has been a significant cause of nature loss, especially in an urban environment. Biodiversity Net Gain offers a mechanism (however imperfect) for Local Authorities to require developers to deliver net gain, and contribute, at least in principle, to nature's recovery. Given its declaration of a climate emergency, and also, so as to ensure 'net gain' on a spreadsheet leads to real world enhancement of nature (10% is a relatively fine margin given the nature of the metrics), we have consistently called for Bristol City

Council to demonstrate leadership and to go beyond the statutory minimum for Biodiversity Net Gain that is required in law. The 10% figure is a minimum level, and Government has made clear that planning authorities can set higher levels: to miss the opportunity to do this at this stage in the Plan process, given the gap between where the Council is, and its stated aspirations, would be a missed opportunity.

Avon Wildlife Trust is therefore calling for the Local Plan to require 20% Biodiversity Net Gain on all developments. The Wildlife Trusts have long advocated for a 20% Biodiversity Net Gain, this is especially important in urban areas where the multiple benefits of nature can be maximised. We are therefore calling for Bristol Council to increase the required Net Gain level to 20%, and in doing so join the ranks of the local authorities and developers who are already showing this leadership.

We are also concerned by the detailed points raised by the Bristol Tree Forum in their letter to Councillors, that:

- The Plan does not contain enough detailed information about the sites in the adopted LP to allow for a proper consultation or independent examination.
- Protection for green spaces has been reduced, contrary to adopted Council policy.
- Despite the recent Ecological and Climate Emergency Declarations, this draft provides fewer environmental protections than the adopted LP.

These are serious concerns that need to be fully considered before the Plan is published.

Finally, we would like to see a longer period for pre-submission representations from whatever point the Local Plan and supporting documents are published as a period of six weeks is a very short amount of time to absorb and respond to such a large amount of material.

Bristol was the first major city to declare an ecological emergency and we need to ensure that we are taking the opportunity provided by the Local Plan to put in place the protections and positive plan needed to restore our damaged ecosystems for the benefit of people and wildlife.

## **STATEMENT PS 03**

**Submitted by Dominic Hogg**

**Title: Bristol Local Plan**

As Councillors will know (not least from the WECA experience), submitting a poorly articulated Draft Plan for Inspection might end up delaying the process of arriving at an approved plan by a considerable time period. A 'back to the drawing board' view from the Inspector implies considerable further delay. That the current Draft Plan is being submitted with such limited community engagement having been undertaken is unfortunate: the delivery of an approved Plan is long overdue, and the absence of one has allowed developers to argue that the tilted balance applies to decision-making, with attendant negative consequences for the quality of development. No one benefits from this. Further delay related to a negative view from the Inspector, however, is also in no one's interest.

There is plenty of reason to question the Plan's alignment with existing Government Policy. Policy UL1 provides perhaps the best example of that conflict, where the concept of 'optimum density' (however that is to be determined) has the potential to distort broader considerations of design quality, which has been a central theme of national planning policy: beauty, and 'optimum density' are not the same thing. There is repeated reference to the 'efficient' use of land: the concept appears to be applied only in respect of housing. Section 11 of the NPPF

I did ask, in the latest consultation process, what the status of the AHPN would be: the 10% get-out which it currently allows has undermined the policy in the current Core Strategy. The same (I presume) note is now referenced in Draft Policy AH1, which states: 'The council's Affordable Housing Practice Note provides guidance on the implementation of this policy.' Given that the AHPN effectively supplanted the policy in the previous Core Strategy, what weight is to be accorded to revised Plan if the AHPN is still considered to apply? Does the 10% get-out in the AHPN still apply, or does the new Policy apply? The question is all the more pertinent given that the policy actually references the AHPN as guidance for implementation.

The Plan claims that development will be on a net zero trajectory: the effective Plan period (we could not find this stated formally) appears to be to 2040. The Net Zero Policies will quickly look extremely out-of-date if there are no in-built mechanisms to index the requirements being set out to key indicators of progress. Nowhere is this more relevant than in the case of the Plan's policy – well intended, and improved post-consultation - on embodied carbon. In the short- to medium-term, this policy should hold the key to delivering the greatest contribution that the City Council can make to climate change mitigation. It does not do so because it is permissive in respect of taller buildings.

The response to the consultation justifies the approach on embodied carbon by stating:

Two criteria for higher risk buildings in the Building Safety Act are if they contain 2 or more dwellings and/or they are above 18m or 7 storeys tall. Buildings above this threshold face



stricter fire safety requirements and are currently unlikely to be able to use timber construction to reduced embodied carbon.

This is rather like saying that we should give greater leeway to diesel vehicles to pollute because it's more difficult to reduce emissions from such vehicles. The rationale is permissive, and weakens the policy's influence on design for low embodied carbon. If the right thing to do from a climate perspective is not to build tall (which the Council's response seems to suggest), then why set policy so that it incentivises tall buildings?

On biodiversity, the Council has adopted to propose a statutory minimum 10% biodiversity net gain from developers. Government policy allows the Council to set higher net gain targets. For a Council which states that we are in the midst of an ecological emergency, a policy that reflects the bare minimum is disappointing. Similarly, whilst the Plan should consider the effective use of land for housing, it should also consider the effective use of land for other purposes. The Plan as it currently stands gives little confidence that the One City plan target - 30 per cent of land in Bristol to be managed for the benefit of wildlife – will be met.

For these and other reasons, we would suggest some further engagement with communities regarding the design of proposed development at the proposed sites, and a more considered reflection on the effect of the Plan in addressing the climate and ecological emergencies which we are in.

## **STATEMENT PS 04**

**Submitted by Adblock Bristol**

**Title: Bristol Local Plan**

Adblock Bristol wish to celebrate the Council's refusal of 40+ new, large, energy-hungry digital advertising screens in the city over the past 5 years. It has been the case that several of these refusals have then been overturned by the Secretary of State on appeal by the advertising company. We therefore strongly welcome the improved guidance on Advertising in the new Local Plan, particularly against new digital billboards, hoping that it will strengthen the hand of the Council in refusing any future applications. We particularly welcome the inclusion of a policy that will guard against the disproportionate placement of intrusive advertising screens in less wealthy areas of the city. Adblock looks forward to the time when all corporate advertising is banned in public spaces in Bristol, for safer streets, darker skies and a culture focused not on material consumption but on community, connection, a thriving local economy, and sustainability.

## **STATEMENT PS 05**

**Submitted by David Redgewell**

**Title: Medium Term Financial Plan**

We are concerned about the lack of enough financial support to maintain the City Region bus and public transport Network.

With this year budget the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council Budget needs to rise by the Transport levy being increase

In Bristol city council, North Somerset council South Gloucestershire county council and Banes .

To the west of England mayor Dan Norris to fund support bus services.

This an urgent situation for 2024 2025

Budget.

One way is to use Car parking fees

To help support the public transport Network and bus services.

Over the last few months the secretary of state for Transport mark Harper and Buses minister Richard Holden has written to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris and councillor Mike Bell and Hannah young transport executive North Somerset council about the need

To redirect money from the bus service improvement into important local support bus services by run by the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.

Some of the deepest bus cuts has happened in Greater Bristol and Bath city region and into the counties of Gloucestershire , Somerset and Wiltshire and Swindon.

With over 40 communities in the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council

Having no public bus services or public Transport service.

When buses are required to get people to work school, College, university heath hospital, shopping and leasure and Tourism facilities.

Many communities are unable to make even the basic food shopping trips or to school and colleges or heath care.

Passengers have attend meetings the bus conversion meetings with mayor Dan Norris on line meeting of Somerset bus partnership had 70 people from across Somerset but a lot of communities in Banes council North Somerset council and South Bristol attended.

Including councillors Parish and ward councillors Passenger and users groups.

Their been youth protest and march with passengers group to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority offices

With councillors and user groups in including Ashton vale estate and oidbury court

,Downend ,Stapleton and Broomhill , Brislington Southmead

Olverton ,Tytherington Easton Eastville the Dings parts of South Bristol

Paulton midsomer Norton Westfield and Radstock.

Westbury on Trym Hortham Alverston Thornbury Tunley Timsbury Chew valley and Blagdon ,Cheddar Axbridge winscombe Banwell and locking all these communities have lost their bus service under the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council bus service improvement plan area .

Theses communities who vote pay taxes have lost their their vital bus services some area do not even have a westlink Demand responsive bus service or local metro west railway Network train service or local ferry service.

Many local residents groups and Tenants association youth groups Bristol oider people forum Bristol disability equilities forum have asked  
Via mps Kerry Mccarthy mp and Luke Hall if the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council bus service improvement plan money could be reallocated to supported Bus services and to reconnect these communities to bus services and the public transport Network.

Many community groups and residents have been unable to attend big conversation meetings due to no public transport in area like the somer Valley  
Or South Bristol Ashton vale or Oidbury court estate, Stapleton, Broomhill  
Or Hortham parts of Bristlington.  
But no daytime meeting or zoom or hybrid meeting are arranged.  
By the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority or North Somerset council.  
This has been requested by Bristol oider people forum and Bristol disability equilities forum.  
With mayor Dan Norris.  
Also that the west of England mayoral combined Authority meeting are hybrid

And can be watched live on U Tube  
Like Bristol city council, South Gloucestershire council North Somerset council and Banes .

We must make progress on the restoration of bus services in the Greater Bristol and Bath city region  
Support bus services.  
We also did not receive Bus service improvement plan plus funding in the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.  
Like Somerset council. £737079  
Gloucestershire county council £884.079  
Wiltshire Council £2115269  
And Swindon Borough Council. £415 830  
For 2024 ,2025

The Department for transport has now allowed bus service improvement plan funding to be extended to 2026  
For the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.  
For the westlink Demand responsive bus services.

Which whilst funded by the Department for transport is manageable but not when it has to be funded by local Taxpayers at about £ 40 per passenger to the local Taxpayer carrying 1 or 2 passengers on trips of 32 miles

This is now being restricted to 20 minute zones .

To connect with main line bus services and local metro west railway Network services and the Falcon coaches part of megabus Scottish City link on the A38  
And at Bristol Airport from the Chew valley.

In the Northern fringe

Westlink Demand responsive bus services need to operate to Filton Abbey station Patchway station, uwe bus station Southmead bus station Bristol Parkway railway station Aztec west roundabout.

Download Bromley Heath, Oidbury court estate Fishponds Broomhill Stapleton Tesco Eastville. Easton Eastville Dings and Bristol Temple meads station.

and in the south zone to extend the bus service to long Ashton park and ride  
Bristolington park and ride and Hungerford road Bristolington.

On the retain bus service improvement plan bus services

X10 Cribbs causeway bus station to to Portishead and Clevedon.

522 Bristol bus and coach station Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale Bristolington  
keynsham marksbury Timsbury Paulton midsomer Norton Tesco rerouting Paulton,Timsbury  
Tunley Bath spa bus and coach station railway interchange.  
Instead of Westfield, Radstock and Peasdown st John  
And around the Chandag Estate

Service 525 Yate North, Yate bus station Westerleigh Puckchurch Emerson green service  
should extend to Downend Bromley Heath Oidbury court Fishponds,Broomhill,Stapleton  
Tesco Eastville,

Maybe not as many service to Yate North as Yate North Yate bus station  
Yate railway station Park and Ride

Winterbourne Cabot Circus, Bristol city centre Service Y2 operates this service

Service 126 Wells bus and coach station. Easton Draycott Cheddar Axbridge Winscombe  
Banwell Locking Hutton ,Weston Super Mare,Hospital Weston Super Mare railway station  
bus and coach station.

The important missing links are

Services 10, 11 Avonmouth Dock Shirehampton Avonmouth to Westbury on Trym  
Southmead hospital bus station uwe bus station, Bristol Parkway station Bradley Stoke ,  
Aztec West Hortham, Alverston ,Thornbury.

Service 36 Bristol city centre Bristol Cabot Circus St Anne's park Bristolington Hungerford road  
Knowle, Hengrove hospital Imperial Park Hartcliffe.

Service 1 1a Cribbs causeway bus and coach station Henbury westbury Clifton Down station, park street, Bristol city centre Bristol cabot circus Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale Bristlington sandy park road shopping centre st Anne's park Brislington Bromhill,Hungerford road Bristlington village School Road St Anne's park Guilford Road Sandy park road Arnos vale.

This route would fill the gap in the network.

Former 5 47 bus route

Service 525

From yate North, Yate bus station, westerleight puckchurch Emerson green service should be extended to Downend Bromley Heath oidbury court Fishponds ,Broomhill,Stapleton, Eastville park Tesco St werburges St Paul's Bristol city centre or Tesco Eastville to terminate.

Service 622 Cribbs causeway bus station to Olverton Alverston Thornbury Tytherington and yate bus and coach station and chipping Sodbury

Service 505 Southmead hospital bus station Horfield Downs Clifton Down Hotwell Ashton gate and long Ashton park and ride.

This service should be extended to Ashton vale estate.

Service 126 needs to run from

Wells bus and coach station to Easton

Westbury sub Mendip Draycott Cheddar Axbridge winscombe, Banwell,Hutton

locking via weston super mare Hospital, and weston super mare bus and coach station

Service 414 ,424 Frome Cork Street coach station

to Radstock Westfield midsomer Norton paulton.

Service 522 Bristol bus and coach station, Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale

Bristlington keynsham marksbury, Timsbury ,Paulton midsomer Norton Tesco rerouting to

Timsbury and Tunley, Bath spa bus and coach station Transport interchange.

We must make progress on the bus service improvement plan and support bus services via the Department for transport funding allocation and the

Transport levy from Bristol city council South Gloucestershire county council Banes council and North Somerset council.

Theses communities have had over 6 months with no public transport Network service.

Westlink Demand responsive bus services.

Has been failing to operate in number of service within the area target of one hour .

At present the Westlink bus service do not operate to railway station at Filton Abbey wood station Patchway station Bristol parkway railway station or Aztec west cribbs causeway bus station Southmead hospital bus station uwe bus and coach station.

To make connections with buses metro bus service and main line bus services.

And South zone to Bristlington park and ride site, Bristol Temple meads station

Oidbury court estate, Broomhill Stapleton village,Easton and the Dings

Whilst Municipalisation or Franchising may be a way forward but will take 5 years to organise buying bus Depots buses in the West of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council area .

Buying assets from stagecoach west and First group plc west of England buses part of First Group plc Wales and West.

With North Somerset council joining the combined Authority and Precept powers for the mayor Dan Norris.

Working with Somerset council Wiltshire Council Swindon and Gloucestershire County council on cross boundary services.

In the meantime we need to restore the bus Network so all communities have access to the bus network for work school College university health shopping and leisure and Tourism facilities.

On the Bristol bus and coach station to Arnos vale ,Bristolington ,keynsham saltford, Newbridge, Weston Bath spa bus and coach station Transport interchange .

We welcome the bus lanes cycling provision bus lanes along the A4 24 hours if First Group plc west of England buses and Rapt Bath bus company operate bus through the night from Bristol Airport to Bishopsworth South Bristol Hengrove Bristolington keynsham Saltford ,Newbridge ,Weston Bath spa Railway station interchange.

Bristol bus and coach station, Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale Bristolington ,keynsham, saltford Newbridge, Weston, Bath spa bus and coach station railway interchange  
X39 39 349 24 hour service.

Similar to x94 Gloucester Transport hub to Cheltenham spa promenade. 24 hour service.

Whilst we do not support the Bristolington bypass we do support the North Somerset railway line being used for a mass transit light rail system From Bristol city centre Bristol Temple meads station St Philips, causeway Arnos vale, Bristolington, keynsham saltford Newbridge Weston Bath spa bus and coach station interchange  
And route via Hengrove and whitchurch estate to Hartcliffe and Bristol Airport.

But first a bus route with a cycleway from Tramway Road to Callington road.

With good Bus stops and interchanges along the A4 at Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale, Bristolington village Keynsham Bypass interchange with links to keynsham Town centre and Railway station, Broadmead roundabout Saltford Town centre Saltford railway station, Corston, Newton st loe, Newbridge and weston and Bath spa bus and coach station.  
Railway interchange.

On mass transit light rail system We support progress on the on the Network study going forward.

Between Bristol city centre Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale Bristlington keynsham saltford Newbridge Weston Bath spa bus and coach station Railway interchange.

Bristol Bus and coach station and Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale Bristlington ,Hengrove hospital imperial park, Hartcliffe, Bristol Airport.

Bristol city centre Bristol Temple meads station Lawrence hill Station st George Staples Hill ,Mangotsfield ,Warmley Bitton , Kelson,Weston Bath Corridor.

Bristol city centre,montpellier railway station to North Bristol.

We welcome the proposal to move forward.

On metro west Railway Network

We need to progress with the

Bristol Temple meads station Bedminster, Parson street, and new station at Ashton Gate, pill and Portishead line.

And Bristol Temple meads station Bristol Lawrence hill Bristol Stapleton Road Ashley Down ,Filton Abbey wood station Filton North and Henbury for cribs causeway and Bristol zoo Including future proofing the Henbury loop line to Avonmouth Dock.

Bring back passengers services on theses routes.

And reopening Charfield and Stonehouse Bristol Road on the Bristol Temple meads station To Filton Abbey wood Bristol Parkway Yate cam and the Dursley, Gloucester central Cheltenham spa, Ashchurch for Tewkesbury ,Worcester Shrub Hill and Worcester, Forgate, Street.

We need to make progress on accessibility station at Bristol Lawrence hill Bristol Stapleton Road, Parson street, Nalisea and Backwell.

Weston super mare lifts

Bridgwater.

Keynsham Oidfiled park Freshford Trowbridge

Cheltenham spa lifts

But we still have no access lifts working at Bristol parkway.

As a Regional railway interchange.

For First Group Great Western Railway Metro west railway trains First group plc Great Western Railway Cross country train Arriva Germany state Railway inter city trains services and bus services.

Stagecoach west and First group plc

West of England.

We also need to retain Bookings offices

The metro west railway Network.

at Bristol Temple meads station Filton Abbey wood station, Bristol parkway yate Gloucester central Cheltenham spa.

Bristol Temple meads station Nalisea and Backwell, Yatton for clevedon worle parkway weston super mare Bridgwater and Taunton



Bristol Temple meads station keynsham Oidfiled park, Bath spa Bradford on Avon  
Trowbridge Westbury warminster Salisbury Frome.

We also have revenue risk without

Ticket machines at shirehampton Avonmouth Dock St Andrews Road seven Beach, Pilning,  
Patchway and Freshford.

When the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset  
council is funding the local railway network.

On railway station and interchange designs like Bristol Portway park and ride whist we  
welcome the new bus interchange for North Bristol Severnside North Somerset bus network  
and Westlink Demand responsive bus services.

We would to see the portway parkway

Park and ride portacabin being replaced with a new terminal building with waiting room  
access toilets and changing places Ev chargers and catering Kiosks.

We need the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset  
council to have an interchange design brief for Bus shelter to bus and coach stations railway  
stations and interchanges

Which are completely acceptable

When Need to make progress on

Metro west Bristol Temple meads station Bedminster parson Street Ashton Gate ,pill  
Portishead.

Bristol Temple meads station Bristol Lawrence hill Bristol Stapleton Road Ashley Down  
station.Filton Abbey wood station. Filton North Henbury for cribs causeway bus station  
and Bristol zoo

Planning permission is required for Henbury railway station.

By South Gloucestershire county council.

Lifts urgently need repairing at Bristol parkway railway station.

And progress Charfield station.

We need to make progress on the Devolution deal and North Somerset council joining North  
Somerset council before the mayoral Elections in 2025 .

And Precepting powers for public transport services.

Whilst Municipalation or Franchising of the bus and coach Network it will take upto 5 years  
to bring about and communities need bus services restored now .

In 2024 2025 budget we need to update the Transport levy for Public transport from Bristol  
city council, North Somerset council Banes and South Gloucestershire county council.

Also in South Gloucestershire county council area money raise from car parking charge  
whilst maintaining car and coach parks can be used to fund local bus coach rail and  
community transport services.

Similar in Bristol and Radstock and midsomer Norton.



# Extraordinary Full Council – 31 October 2023

## Agenda item 6 b

### Public questions



#### Procedural note:

##### Questions submitted by members of the public:

- Questions must be related to items on the agenda.
- Members of the public who live and/or have a business in Bristol are entitled to submit up to 2 written questions, and to ask up to 2 supplementary questions. A supplementary question must arise directly out of the original question or the reply.
- Replies to questions will be given verbally by the Mayor (or a Cabinet member where relevant). Written replies will be published within 10 working days following the meeting.



\*point of explanation - where a person has asked two questions on the same topic they are on the same line. Where topics are different they have different lines.

<b>Ref No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
PQ01	Rob Bryher	Bristol Local Plan
PQ02	Haydn Gill	Medium Term Financial Plan
PQ03	Michelle Tedder	Bristol Local Plan
PQ04	Peter Ellis	Bristol Local Plan
PQ05	Dan Ackroyd	Minutes of Previous Meeting
PQ06	Ad Block Bristol	Bristol Local Plan
PQ07	Bristol Civic Society	Bristol Local Plan



**QUESTION PQ 01**

**Subject: Bristol Local Plan**

**Question submitted by: Rob Bryher**

**Question 1:**

I have checked the Local Development Scheme, but it is not clear when to expect the Transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (covering loading, parking, kerbside management and EV charging points) which is mentioned a couple of times in section 10 (Transport) of the Bristol Local Plan (Publication Version). This is potentially a very significant document in terms of green infrastructure and alternative kerbside uses (such as parklets and cycle/scooter storage) within highway space, which is more and more necessary to create good quality spaces close to where people live.

**Do you currently have a timescale for when you expect the Transport SPD to be produced and adopted?**

**Question 2:**

It's really encouraging that the old Hirestation building and wider site at 222-232 Church Road, St George is being allocated for housing-led mixed use with active uses of the ground floor. It has been an eyesore and a blight on the local community for a long time.

**Please can you tell me whether there are any current plans to compulsory purchase the site from its current owner?**



**QUESTION PQ 02****Subject: Medium Term Financial Plan****Question submitted by: Haydn Gill****Q1 Subject: Medium Term Financial Plan - Workplace parking levy**

With the council forecasting a gap of £32.1 million, the Highways department alone holding a £1 million funding gap, and a Mayor who wants solutions not problems, why isn't the Mayor implementing the workplace parking levy as soon as possible?

The Mayor is publicly a fan of backing transport feasibility studies with cost estimates. In the workplace parking levy feasibility study, the council accepted 'core' scenario estimated £2 million of revenue each year, before inflation. This revenue stream could fund pothole repairs, replace bus stops driven into by dangerous drivers or even fund a feasibility study of a Bristol tram network.

**Q2 Subject: Medium Term Financial Plan - Parking permits**

In the 14 March Full council, the Mayor said in response to questions about Redcatch park's astronomical rent offer: "Even the act of the council raising revenue is sometimes looked on as a bad thing, but that revenue goes into the funding for services which people campaign to have in place...The funding model for local government now requires us to generate revenue to fund services"

The highway is a council asset and by giving every adult the ability to store an unlimited number of private vehicles on public land, 12 metres squared of hardstanding, with drainage and lighting, all within a very cramped and constrained city not built for cars. The Mayor isn't removing this subsidy for wealthy adult vehicle owners, paid for out of everyone's council tax, where 26% of households in Bristol don't even have access to a car and van and those on the lowest incomes most likely to not have a car. The Mayor is aligning his values with the Conservative Prime Minister, a tricky position to be in as a Labour Mayor.

With this in mind, alongside the £1 million funding gap for the Highways department, and a Mayor who wants solutions not problems, why is the Mayor continuing to block any expansion or new zones for parking permits across Bristol to raise revenue to fund key services?



**QUESTION PQ 03**

**Subject: Bristol Local Plan**

**Question submitted by: Michelle Tedder**

Please can you explain why some sites documented in the 2019 draft "Site Allocations" list do not now appear in this latest draft Local Plan "Site Allocations" list.



**QUESTION PQ 04**

**Subject: Bristol Local Plan**

**Question submitted by: Peter Ellis**

Draft Policy NZC3 has differential targets for proposed residential buildings depending on the number of storeys. A kilogram of carbon has the same impact on the city's carbon ambitions, so will the Mayor explain why the proposed KgCO<sub>2</sub>e per m<sup>2</sup> targets for, say, a 30 storey tall building are less onerous than, say, for the modern day equivalent of the familiar 4-storey Georgian terraced house?





**QUESTION PQ 05**

**Subject: Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**Question submitted by: Dan Ackroyd**

"The draft minutes for the committee meeting on the 10th October do not seem to contain the normal items for 'Members Present' and 'Apologies for Absence'. Should they be there?"



**QUESTION PQ 06**

**Subject: Bristol Local Plan**

**Question submitted by: Adblock Bristol**

"To Mayor Marvin Rees. Adblock Bristol strongly welcomes the inclusion of Advertising-specific policies within the new Local Plan. While celebrating the strengthening of the policy around the acceptance of new advertising hoardings, particularly new digital screens, we would like to draw attention to the ongoing proliferation of poster advertising sites on fences and walls around the City. These have been placed without advertising permission and seem to be immune from any enforcement action. What is the Council doing to eliminate this form of advertising?"



## QUESTION PQ 07

**Subject: Bristol Local Plan**

**Question submitted by: Bristol Civic Society**

### 1) Local Plan consultation period

There are some 1000 pages to read in the local plan and supporting documents. If the period for pre-submission representations is limited to six weeks, hard working Bristolians will, in the run up to Christmas, have to read getting on for 20 pages of dense planning-speak every evening to understand the impact on them, their children's future and their environment. Meanwhile developers will have teams of consultants working round the clock to ensure their voice is heard. In the interest of transparency and fairness, will the Mayor extend the consultation period to at least 10 weeks and encourage his officers to get out into the community to help people understand how the plan affects them?

### 2) Quantification of carbon emissions

A combination of law and national policy requires local plans to have a proactive approach to mitigating climate change in line with the Climate Change Act's net zero target and the supporting carbon budgets. Here in Bristol we have our own ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030. There are policies in the plan addressing climate change and a descriptive overview of their impact in the sustainability appraisal, but we do not know the actual scale of emissions the plan is likely to give rise to, not least through the embodied carbon in new development. If a quantitative assessment has been carried out, will the Mayor share it before Council is asked to approve the plan?

